DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 426 479 EA 029 577

AUTHOR	Lockwood, Anne Turnbaugh
TITLE	School-Community Collaboration.
INSTITUTION	North Central Regional Educational Lab., Oak Brook, IL.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	1996-01-00
NOTE	35p.; First article written with Lynn J. Stinnette and Joseph D'Amico.
CONTRACT	RP10020007
AVAILABLE FROM	Web site: http://www.ncrel.org/cscd/pubs/newlead.htm
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Guides - Non-Classroom (055)
JOURNAL CIT	New Leaders for Tomorrow's Schools; v2 n1 Jan 1996
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Cooperative Programs; Elementary Secondary Education; Family School Relationship; *Integrated Services; *Partnerships in Education; School Community Programs; *School Community Relationship; Student Development
IDENTIFIERS	Wehlage (Gary)

ABSTRACT

The collaborative efforts between a school and its community can profoundly influence educational effectiveness. An examination of the relationship between schools and their communities, with an emphasis on exploring how some schools work effectively with parents, agencies, and businesses to form sustainable partnerships, is offered in this report. Two forms of school-community collaboration are highlighted: (1) school-linked, integrated services; and (2) school-to-work initiatives. The opening essay makes the case for collaboration among schools, communities, and families and provides an overview of school- linked services and school-to-work initiatives. It emphasizes the importance of collective endeavors and provides an overview of some of the obstacles to school-community collaboration and the need to balance leadership in the schools and the community. Some promising examples of collaboration chosen from schools nationwide are offered, as are the results of research on school-community collaboration and disadvantaged youth. The high goal of collaborative efforts--the quality of relationships among people as they work together toward the common good--is outlined, followed by a brief description of emerging reforms that are influencing schools. A leadership questionnaire and an annotated bibliography on school-community collaboration are presented. (RJM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 426 479

New LEADERS FOR TOMORROW'S SCHOOLS

School-Community Collaboration

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

JANUARY 1996 VOLUME 2 NO. 1

ISSUE HIGHLIGHTS:

Collaborating for the Common Good 2
Promising School-linked Services Initiatives 11
Promising School-to-Work Initiatives 13
Special Leadership Insert 15
An Interview with Gary G. Wehlage 19
Selected Emerging Reforms 23

In this issue, *School and Community Collaboration*, we examine the relationship between schools and their communities, exploring how some schools work effectively with parents, agencies, and businesses to form sustainable partnerships that improve the well-being of students, their families, and their communities. Specifically, we highlight two forms of school-community collaboration, selected for their potential to improve the education and future for many young people: school-linked, integrated services and school-to-work initiatives. Of course, schools and community agencies cannot embark upon these endeavors without enlightened social policy that re-engineers funding of educational and social services, revamps school organizational structures, modifies curriculum standards, and changes data gathering and reporting mechanisms to aid decisions related to accountability.

In our opening essay, we make the case for collaboration between schools, communities, and families and provide an overview of school-linked services and school-to-work initiatives. Next, we share some promising examples of collaboration — both school-linked services and school-to-work initiatives, respectively — chosen from schools nationwide. Third, we hear from a researcher whose work focuses on school-community collaboration and disadvantaged youth. Gary G. Wehlage, Associate Director of the Center on Restructuring and Organization of Schools, discusses what he considers a higher goal of collaborative efforts: social capital, or the quality of relationships among people as they work together toward the common good. Fourth, as a special feature, we include a brief description of emerging reforms to complement the previous issue of *New Leaders for Tomorrow's Schools*, which provided an in-depth view of four major reforms. As a special insert to this issue, we feature a leadership questionnaire that we encourage you to use to reflect upon your own leadership style. Finally, we conclude with an annotated bibliography intended to inform your nascent or already experienced efforts toward school-community collaboration.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EA 026 571

Collaborating For The Common Good

by Anne Turnbaugh Lockwood with Lynn J. Stinnette and Joseph D'Amico

Why is collaboration between schools and communities — specifically families, social service agencies, other community organizations, and health care providers — truly necessary? Do the many obstacles that dot the landscape of educational reform also block the path of collaborative efforts? If so, how might they be overcome? How do schools and communities collectively define the common good — and how do they work together to achieve it? Should "professionals" who work in schools and community agencies determine what services are provided and in what manner, or should the recipients of the services decide for themselves? Finally, what benefits accrue to youth, families, and institutions as a result of successful collaborative efforts between schools and communities?

In this essay, we examine these questions and provide an overview of two forms of school-community collaboration: school-linked services and school-to-work initiatives. First, we explain why collaboration between schools, families, and communities is increasingly important both for the improved lives of families and communities and for heightened student achievement. Next, we discuss the question of collectively defining and realizing the common good. Third, we focus on school-linked services, discussing their goals and their potential for schools, families, and communities. Next, we turn to school-to-work initiatives, listing and describing the various types of programs currently underway nationwide. Fourth, we outline some of the obstacles to successful collaboration. We conclude with some over-arching tenets of collaborative leadership. In a feature that follows this essay, we provide succinct descriptions of promising programs, featuring both school-linked services and school-to-work initiatives from across the nation.

The Case for Collaboration

Jonathan Kozol (1967, 1989, 1991, 1995) has documented eloquently the status of children in our society and the crisis public social institutions face in attempting to meet their needs. Crumbling school facades, inadequate or broken plumbing, insufficient or outdated textbooks and instructional materials, and physically unsafe learning environments dominate our inner cities, as do dangers children encounter on a daily basis in their neighborhoods. The omnipresent threat of violence, the specter of drugs and gangs, inadequate childcare, dead-end jobs with low pay or unemployment, and a disintegrating economy all contribute to fragile youth and vulnerable families. School staff and social service providers who exist in such communities also suffer from inadequate resources, a constant drain on their emotions and morale, and insufficient training or expertise that would allow them to deal adequately with the problems children bring to them.

Parents are afflicted equally. Many remember unsuccessful, unhappy school experiences and look forward only to unskilled labor and low pay as the economic picture darkens and corporations pull out of urban areas in increasing numbers. Left to depend upon uncertain welfare and government subsidies, these parents find little encouragement that schools or community agencies will make a positive impact on their lives or the lives of their children (Lockwood, forthcoming).

While suburbs — and suburban schools — do not usually suffer from the same dire lack of financial resources, emotional impoverishment is not exclusive to cities. In cities, suburbs, and rural areas alike, adults and children are increasingly isolated from one another, alienated from their schools, suffused with cynicism about the social services available to them, and scorched by previous negative experiences with either school staff or social service agencies. Wealthier communities carry their own baggage: in a time when corporate restructuring has left many previously well-to-do parents scrambling for career opportunities, their children may feel the simultaneous press of high expectations along with a growing conviction that the education at elite colleges and universities — toward which they have been directed from an early age — may not result in a stable, well-paying job, let alone the career trajectory their parents expect. A growing sense of

hopelessness and depression, use of drugs, teen suicide, and other self-destructive behaviors may result.

This isolation is not new, nor is it the exclusive territory of one socioeconomic group or one type of community. Sociologist David Riesman (1950) identified its presence over 30 years ago when he termed the contemporary American sense of character "the lonely crowd." This descriptive term has strengthened over the past 30 years as Americans have become increasingly self-directed, even narcissistic in pursuing their own goals (Lasch, 1978). In fact, this phrase captures the essence of contemporary life: simultaneously crowded and lonely, noisy and isolated. Modern technology and the information age, while facilitating connections between individuals and groups worldwide, also has the potential to further isolate people as they embark — essentially alone — on the information superhighway.

The Importance of Collective Endeavor

In the face of such overwhelming need, what does collaborative action offer? Most people would agree that it is considerably easier for children to develop and learn with the support of strong families who in turn enjoy the support of individuals and institutions in their surrounding communities. However, the increase in single-parent and dual-income families — coupled with the gradual disappearance of village-like communities — leaves a growing number of children and families woefully isolated from helping relationships, peer and emotional support, and access to referral services (Weiss, Woodrum, Lopez, & Kraemer, 1993).

When families, schools, and community institutions (e.g., local businesses, community colleges, and health agencies) collectively agree upon their goals and decide how to reach them, everyone benefits. Schools enjoy the informed support of families and community members, families experience many opportunities to contribute to their children's education, and communities look forward to an educated, responsible workforce. Benefits accrue to the staff of schools and community agencies as well: they can observe boosts in morale, heightened engagement in their work, and a feeling that their work will net results.

Researchers and practitioners have documented for some time how schools and communities working toward common goals can be beneficial. Communities can provide schools with a context and environment that can either complement and reinforce the values, culture, and learning the schools provide for their students or negate everything the schools strive to accomplish (Ada, 1994; Bricker, 1989; Nieto, 1992). Communities also can furnish schools — and the students in them — with crucial financial support systems as well as the social and cultural values necessary for success and survival in contemporary society (Mattesich & Monsey, 1993; MDC, Inc., 1991; Miller, 1991). Finally, communities have the potential to extend a variety of opportunities to students and to their families — social, cultural, and vocational (Bell & Sigsworth, 1987; Hull, 1994).

Schools, in turn, offer communities a focal point of educational services for children. Symbolically, schools are seen by many as the last enduring public institutions in many communities (Lockwood, forthcoming). Instruction typically includes lessons in social and cultural skills — particularly in the elementary grades — in addition to acculturation into mainstream values and ethics. Schools frequently provide employment for community residents

Anne Turnbaugh Lockwood, an education writer and analyst, is an Honorary Fellow in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, University of Wisconsin — Madison.

Lynn J. Stinnette is Director of NCREL's Center for School and Community Development.

Joseph D'Amico is Coordinator of NCREL's Community Development Program.

and, in some cases, offer community services. Most important, schools have the potential to build well-educated citizens ready to take on responsibilities as contributing community members.

By working together, schools, families, and communities can prepare for a more promising future. In urban communities struggling against violence, unemployment, and deteriorating institutions, school-community collaboration offers hope for those who may have given up on the social institutions in their neighborhoods and cities. Rural communities searching for opportunities to revitalize themselves in a technologically sophisticated society can discover ways to bring themselves into the information age by intertwining school and community improvement initiatives.

Collaborative endeavors require, at minimum, effective communication between all parties and participatory leadership with the ability to negotiate conflict and differences.

School-Linked, Integrated Services

What goals and characteristics do school-linked services and school-to-work initiatives require to be effective? Linking health and social services directly to schools can help children arrive at school ready to learn and grow. By integrating the work of the many community agencies that provide children with essential health care, social welfare, and similar services, successful collaboratives blend resources and offer comprehensive and preventive services that are family-focused. Joy Dryfoos uses the term "full-service schools" when she advocates for a whole array of emerging models, including school-based health centers, youth service centers, community schools, and family resource centers. Dryfoos maintains that services provided by community agencies in school buildings can become a new type of institution: comprehensive, one-stop educational service centers (Dryfoos, 1994).

Based on growing evidence that the school frequently is the most stable feature of children's lives, this approach puts the school at the center of these services either as a point of early diagnosis and referral or as a point of delivery. Agencies providing services are connected to the school and collaborate with the educational system to make sure no child "falls through the cracks."

Current efforts to reform schooling all advocate a comprehensive approach to improving the quality of teaching and learning — an approach that bonds schools to families and their surrounding communities. Janet Levy (1989, p. 1) is among those advocates of school-linked, integrated services and has offered a compelling rationale: "... education and human services face *common* challenges as they try to help the *same* people respond to the *same* problems. Moreover, the goals that each system is setting for its own reform effort cannot be fully realized alone, but depend on complementary action from ... other sectors."

Defining the Common Good

One important consideration in any collaborative venture is the question: Who decides? Who decides what is needed, how it should be delivered, and who will be targeted as the recipients of the service? Some evidence suggests that when a bureaucratic model of collaboration is imposed upon a community, it fails because the targeted population was not consulted adequately about what it wanted and resents having yet another well-intentioned program imposed upon them (Wehlage & White, 1995). One especially successful model of collaboration is the Beacons Project in New York City, which has a participatory decision-making structure that frequently uses community residents — instead of agency personnel — to offer services to other residents (Wehlage & White, 1995). If professionals in schools and community agencies are not the sole decision-makers about the type and level of service

In cities, suburbs, and rural areas alike, adults and children are increasingly isolated from one another, alienated from their schools, suffused with cynicism about the social services available to them, and scorched by previous negative experiences with either school staff or social service agencies. Wealthier communities carry their own baggage: in a time when corporate restructuring has left many previously well-to-do parents scrambling for career opportunities, their children may feel the simultaneous press of high expectations along with a growing conviction that the education at elite colleges and universities — toward which they have been directed from an early age — may not result in a stable, well-paying job, let alone the career trajectory their parents expect. A growing sense of hopelessness and depression, use of drugs, teen suicide, and other self-destructive behaviors may result.

and educational programs to be provided to the community, the entire collaborative effort becomes much more complex, more authentic, and has the potential to be much more successful in the long-term (Wehlage & White, 1995).

When schools enter into partnerships with social and health services, they have to consider carefully and be willing to modify the ways in which they interact with families and community agencies. Community agency staff must do the same. It is almost certain that school personnel will have to reexamine assignments, relationships, and roles (Kirst & Jehl, 1995). Both parties — schools and agencies — often have to learn new ways to work together, sharing space, information, and goals. Collaborative endeavors require, at minimum, effective communication between all parties and participatory leadership with the ability to negotiate conflict and differences. Depending on the type of collaborative endeavor, teachers, support staff, principals, and district administrators may need to develop new competencies to participate effectively in these collaboratives.

Before embarking upon a collaborative action between schools and communities, educators can realize the complexities of working as a team when they reflect on their own experiences with educational reform. Just as there is no definitive blueprint that guides specific steps to be taken within a school or district, there is no definitive recipe to follow in building a successful collaborative. However, research and practice suggest that effective school-linked services initiatives are:

- Comprehensive
- Preventive
- Family-centered and family-driven
- Integrated
- Developmental
- Flexible
- Sensitive to race, gender, culture, and individuals with disabilities
- Outcomes-oriented
- Committed to the effort for the long term
- Devoted to the higher goal of building social capital or a web of human relationships that transcends the actual collaboration (Melaville & Blank with Asayesh, 1993)

Michael Kirst, Stanford University researcher, in a recent paper (1994) prepared for the AERA/OERI Conference on School Linked Services (SLS), points to five components of effective school-linked, integrated services programs:

1. *Co-location of a wide range of services and children's activities from public and private agencies.* Such a program might be located on or near a school, be open from 6 to 6; and have parent education.
2. *A complete change in the services* delivery system. Usually, school-linked services programs bring about information exchange among service providers but do not change

categorical program rules and regulations. Comprehensive change would mean multiple agency intake and assessments, confidentiality waivers, shared staff, case management, across-agency agreement on outcomes that would be used for accountability purposes, and reliance on established revenue streams rather that short-term grants.

3. *School restructuring that builds upon and fosters the school-linked services initiative.* In successful initiatives, teachers express ownership in the school-linked services initiative, have frequent conferences with agency staff, know how to refer students, enjoy regular feedback from health and social services personnel, and take advantage of the SLS to improve their own instructional and disciplinary practices.
4. *A parent center that meets a range of expressed parent needs and extends itself to welcome parents as genuine partners.* Successful initiatives understand that partnership is a two-way process in which schools respond to parent and family needs with positive educational, social, and recreational activities, and parents provide critical information about their children's needs.
5. *The involvement and provision of services through youth organizations that can speak for adolescents rather than labeling them as problems.* Adolescents face many dangers to health and well-being and rarely participate in a dialogue to identify problems and alternative solutions (McLaughlin, 1994, in Kirst, 1994). Successful collaboratives for middle school children tap into the world and perspectives of youth they are trying to serve (Kirst, 1994).

The Harvard Family Research Project suggests three important tools for building successful school-based services initiatives:

- *Intensive planning.* Partners should plan and carry out community needs assessments, create formal interagency agreements that define roles and responsibilities, establish consistent policies on data sharing and confidentiality, and set up reliable referral mechanisms.
- *Broad scope.* Cross-agency communications are essential for designing and delivering the services, instead of rigid organizational arrangements modeled on a bureaucratic pyramid. Planning time, joint tasks and rewards, and access to information systems are just as important.
- *Smart budgeting.* In addition to bringing in new money, successful collaboratives redistribute existing funds, energy, space, staff, and other resources.

Practitioners and policymakers would agree that putting Kirst's five major components into place is no small task — nor are the three tools suggested by the Harvard Family Project simple to use. When schools and community agencies join forces to integrate and link services, they often encounter significant obstacles, but can overcome them through planning that involves major stakeholders and strategic reallocation of available funds.

School-to-Work

Just as school-linked health and social services can help ensure children's readiness for school, a comprehensive program of school-to-work endeavors can help ensure that youngsters are ready for life after school. Because of this fact, educators typically place a high premium on these programs. Most experts put school-to-work in a context of "transition" and refer to effective school-to-work initiatives as "transition systems" (Benson, 1993). Further, they — and more recently state and federal education agencies — link such initiatives to larger issues of educational reform (Glover, 1993). For instance, when the federal government installed the School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994 (P.L. 103-239), it explicitly called for a national framework to enable creation of statewide school-to-work opportunities *systems* that are part of *comprehensive educational reform.*

The interest in preparing students for the world of work is not a new one in America; it dates back at least 70 years or more to the first vocational education programs. The current push for school-to-work, however, grew from a combination of startling statistics describing the lack of workforce readiness (Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce, 1990; NCREL, 1995) and pressure from American business to address the situation (Benson, 1993; Murnane & Levy, 1992; Pauley et al, 1995). In response, local schools and districts with support and assistance from the U.S. Department of Education and their state departments of education have been experimenting with different models of school-to-work.

There probably are hundreds of different school-to-work models in the United States today — most idiosyncratic to school and community contexts (Pauley, et al., 1995). However, to a certain degree they can be clustered according to the following types:

1. *Youth Apprenticeship:* Students engage in structured

learning experiences in the workplace at the elbow of a skilled technical worker.

2. *Tech Prep:* Students follow an articulated series of courses over four or more years (often continuing beyond high school into a two-year post-secondary institution) to prepare for a range of occupations within one industry (e.g., printing).
3. *Career Academies:* A school-within-a-school or mini-school where a group of students and a team of teachers stay together for a block of time each day over the course of several years with instruction combining academic and vocational content that is focused on a single industry cluster (e.g., health care).
4. *Cooperative Education (or Restructured Vocational Education):* A loosely structured one-year (or less) program where students spend part of their day in school and part at a job site, perhaps getting paid while learning what is needed to perform that job (e.g., clerk/typist, according to the terms of a training agreement between the employer and a teacher (Winters, 1994).
5. *Occupational-Academic Clusters:* These clusters are a large-scale effort to offer all students in a high school a choice among several career paths (for example, auto repair, banking, exercise physiology, retail management) with each path providing a sequence of related courses tied to a cluster of occupations (Pauly et. al, 1995).
6. *Hybrid Programs:* Programs that combine various elements of different types of programs (Pauly et. al, 1995).

Although some authors believe that the United States' approach to school-to-work is a "mosaic of programs designed to help students make the connection between school and work" (Charner, 1995, p. 40), others see a fairly high degree of consistency among current school-to-work efforts, particularly in terms of their goals. These goals for the most part emphasize giving students exposure to, training in, and experience with the information, skills, and guidance needed to enter and succeed in the careers of their choice.

Many authors also agree that there are a finite, recognizable set of key principles that underlie successful school-to-work initiatives. Winters (1994) has outlined eight that capture this consensus. They are:

1. Strong collaboration with the private sector, where businesses are both a source of student employment and a co-developer of program elements
2. Support from community colleges for job-related and academic program elements, especially as students move beyond high school
3. High standards for all participating students, which means elimination of tracking and general or basic courses, and introduction of uniform academic and job-skill standards
4. Incentives for students ranging from tangible ones such as paid work experience to ones less tangible — but no less motivational — such as overlap between the workplace and academic subjects
5. Comprehensive career guidance and counseling to assist all participating students as they explore, experiment with, and eventually select career paths
6. Integration of academic and technical learning programmatically as well as through the use of authentic instructional activities so students see connections between job-related, real-life and school skills

A comprehensive program of school-to-work endeavors can help ensure that youngsters are ready for life after school.

Any type of collaborative effort is complex, requiring the positive interaction of many people from diverse sectors of the community in which the collaboration is based.

7. Organizational and cultural integration between the school site and work site that accounts for activities associated with, for example, job-site supervision, mentoring, employer training, and the like
8. Inclusion of a "growth into the future" approach so students understand the importance of lifelong learning as a way to help them grow not only in their chosen careers but generally, too

Other supplements to this list include provision of professional development for participating teachers and workplace mentors (Paris, 1994); certification of workplace and academic mastery using validated measures of performance (Bissett, 1993); installation of some type of formal governance mechanism, such as a cooperative agreement to specify roles, relationships, and accountabilities (Grubb, 1994); and extensive formal and informal commitment, follow through, and communication among partners (U.S. Department of Labor Employment and Training, 1992).

Finally, a wide range of authors point to a group of characteristics that the majority of successful school-to-work programs share. Charner (1995) summarizes these characteristics as follows:

1. Committed, aggressive leadership from school and district administration as well as from the school board
2. Strong commitment, adaptability, and willingness to take risks on the part of those who deliver the school-based aspects of the program — teachers, counselors, and support staff
3. Cross-sector collaboration and partnership that gives substantive roles to the educators, business people, community members, and post-secondary representatives involved
4. Fostering of self-determination for students; that is, letting them also have a substantive role in the design and delivery of the program while holding them accountable for their own success
5. High coordination and integration of school-based and work-based learning through authenticity and real-life relevance of learning activities
6. Incorporation of strong career information and guidance components that help students make informed, reasoned choices
7. Inclusion of a progressive, feeder transition system that starts as early as the elementary grades and, at least, exposes younger students to a range of career opportunities
8. Safeguards against tracking or "dead-ending" students by always ensuring them access to post-secondary options
9. Use of "creative financing" to handle the special requirements and often high additional costs

Taken together, these goals, principles, and key elements can serve almost as a blueprint for development and implementation of an effective school-to-work program.

Obstacles to School-Community Collaboration

Any type of collaborative effort is complex, requiring the positive interaction of many people from diverse sectors of the community in which the collaboration is based. School leaders and community leaders do not always share the same goals; members of the general public may disagree with any agenda set forth by either schools or community agencies — or both, proposing yet a different course of action.

The experiences of New Futures, the ambitious agenda of comprehensive, collaborative

reform launched in five cities and funded by the Annie E. Casey Foundation, illustrate the many difficulties communities, families, and schools encounter when they embark upon a collaborative initiative. The New Futures effort targeted disadvantaged urban youth who were dropping out of school, becoming parents, and facing bleak futures of under- or no employment. Over five years, the Casey Foundation awarded $50 million to five American cities: Dayton, Little Rock, Savannah, Lawrence, and Pittsburgh (Lawrence withdrew after approximately 18 months).

The major lessons the five cities learned through their experiences included the following:

- Comprehensive reforms remain very difficult to plan and implement because of their complexity.
- Communication gaps between parties were significant and based on the historical isolation of the parties from one another.
- Lack of adequate, up-front time was allotted to build constituencies, conduct detailed assessments of the current state of services and resources, build the management capacities necessary to sustain the effort over time and through changes in leadership, and allow for careful planning of strategically sequenced change.
- Many cities are not suited to comprehensive collaboration because of their individual readiness, lack of leadership commitment, insufficient resources (financial, political, intellectual), or lack of excitement about a systems change approach.
- Building local ownership of a collaborative is difficult.
- Original plans need constant evaluation, refinement, and modification.
- Communication between and among parties is essential at every stage of the collaboration, especially the beginning (Annie E. Casey Foundation,1995).

Advocates for school-linked services hope that ultimately these integrated services will improve children's lives, with academic achievement heading the list as the preeminent goal, both short-term and long-term. In addition, as Dryfoos and others have shown, there are many positive outcomes for children and families that could result from school-linked services initiatives.

Collaborative Leadership: Balancing the School-Community Equation

Obviously, leadership is an essential component to building successful collaboration between schools and communities. What can principals and other leaders do to foster successful collaboration between their schools and communities? These suggestions offer guidance to help you examine and reflect on your leadership capabilities and practices.

Research and practice suggest that collaborative leaders*

- Are inclusive, carefully involving all stakeholders
- Nurture leadership in others
- Communicate effectively across organizational boundaries
- Reach out to talk with and learn from consumers of services
- Articulate a strong vision of how organizations, communities, and people join forces to work together
- Are able to mobilize and neutralize differences among group members
- Can manage and resolve conflicts skillfully
- Show sensitivity to the conflicts group members face
- Have a strong understanding of the community's capabilities and assets
- Are honest in dealing with others and inspire trust
- Take risks and encourage others to do so
- Challenge others and model active listening and problem solving
- Encourage group responsibility rather than relying on individual responsibility
- Understand and model consensus decision making rather than hierarchical decision making
- Encourage the ongoing learning of everyone in the organization
- Are politically savvy
- Generate resources and allocate them strategically
- Manage disparate responsibilities well

* Based in part on recommendations outlined in *Preparing Collaborative Leaders: A Facilitator's Guide* (Institute for Educatinal Leadership, 1994).

References can be found on page 31.

"Relate the school to life, and all studies are of necessity correlated."

John Dewey, *The School and Society*, 1899

Promising School-Linked Services Initiatives

Family Academy
Harlem, NY

The Family Academy, founded by director David Liben and staff members Meredith Liben and Christina Giammalva, opened in 1991 in the heart of Harlem in School District 3. The Academy, housed in a small public elementary school, is open until 5 p.m. each day throughout the school's 11-month academic year. The guiding philosophy and mission of the school is to foster a sense of belonging and a sense of community among students, families, and educators. Students remain with the same 50 classmates while at the school, where a psychologist, social worker, teachers, and administrators develop lesson plans to build children's basic skills, weave in ethics and social values, promote healthy emotional and social growth, and foster self-esteem. Annual screenings of each pupil help the school's learning specialist and child psychologist design future instruction. The Academy's on-site Family Services Center coordinates and speeds access to public assistance, public housing, legal aid, health care, drug rehabilitation, and foster care. *For more information contact: Christina Giammalva, President & Co-Founder, Family Academy, 220 West 121st Street, New York, NY 10027, (212) 749-3558, FAX (212) 749-1581.*

Illinois Project Success
State of Illinois

Project Success was introduced in May 1992 in six communities. Today the program is in effect in 90 communities. Project Success challenges local community leaders, educators, parents, and state social service agencies to work together to identify and efficiently act upon problems of school-age children. Each community embraces the six core service components of the program to ensure that every child and family has access to preventive and primary health care; proper nutrition and nutrition education; preventive and rehabilitative mental health services; services that will protect and promote the stability of the family; substance abuse prevention, intervention, and treatment; and positive social activities. *For more information contact:, Lori Williams, Project Success Specialist, Office of the Governor 2 1/2 Capitol, Springfield, IL 62706, (217) 782-1446, FAX (217) 524-1678.*

Kentucky Family Resource and Youth Centers
State of Kentucky

In 1990, Kentucky legislators laid the foundation for comprehensive, statewide, integrated service delivery as a part of the Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA). Today, over 400 Family Resource and Youth Service Centers are located at or near school sites throughout the state of Kentucky. The Centers provide services in the areas of substance abuse, child care, mental health, maternity, and employment counseling. Generally, Family Resource Centers serve elementary students and Youth Service Centers assist middle and high school students, but some combination centers serve K-12 students. To qualify as a Kentucky Family Resource or Youth Service Center, a school site must have a student population with 20 percent or more eligible for free school lunch. Once established, the centers are open to everyone. *For more information, contact: Family Resource and Youth Service Centers, Cabinet for Human Resources, 275 East Main Street, Frankfort, KY 40621, (502) 564-4986.*

New Beginnings
San Diego, CA

New Beginnings is a school-based coalition of education, social, and health service providers. At New Beginnings, family service advocates provide families with ongoing counseling and service planning and refer them to needed educational, social, and health services. *For more information, contact: Connie M. Roberts, Director, New Beginnings, County of San Diego Department of Social Services, 1255 Imperial Avenue, Room 843, San Diego, CA 92101, (619) 338-2945 or (619) 338-2446, FAX: (619) 338-2876; or Jack Campana, Life Skills Education Coordinator, Comprehensive Health and Physical Education, San Diego Unified School District, 4100 Normal St., San Diego, CA 92103, (619) 293-8213, FAX (619) 294-2146.*

Rheedlen Centers for Children and Families Program
New York, NY

Started in 1970, this program provides preventive services to keep at-risk students in school and ensure that they receive a meaningful education. All programs, including recreational programs, have an academic component. The program mainly serves economically disadvantaged African American families in Central Harlem, East Harlem, Manhattan Valley, and Clinton. More than 100 teachers, social workers, activity specialists, and program aides administer services through seven programs, including a Truancy Prevention Program; the Rheedlen Dropout Prevention Programs; a Parents' Help Center; Project Motivation, a school-based program to provide services to community members; and Rheedlen Place, which provides short-term educational and social services to families and children facing homelessness. The Centers also operate Center 54, a community center in Manhattan for students already involved in the academic component of the Centers. Center 54 is open five days a week from 3 p.m. to 10 p.m. for seven months of the year and until 6 p.m. for the remaining five months. *For more information, contact: Geoffrey Canada, Executive Director, Rheedlen Centers for Children and Families Program, 2770 Broadway, New York, NY 10025, (212) 866-0700.*

Success by 6
Pinellas County, FL

This United Way-inspired initiative was started in Minneapolis in 1988 by a group of business and community leaders and in Pinellas County in 1992 by Richard G. Clawson, president of United Way of Pinellas County; James E. Mills, executive director of the Juvenile Welfare Board; and Carl Vignali, then general manager of the Space Systems Division of the Honeywell Corporation. Guided by TQM (Total Quality Management) principles, a task force was formed in 1993 to launch the project. The group engaged in community needs assessments and brought together focus groups of parents, teachers, child care providers, and agency representatives. Based on the premise that prevention ultimately saves money and futures, the goal of Success by 6 is to foster, from birth, each child's physical, mental, social, and emotional development so that they will become successful students and lead happy, rewarding lives. *For more information, contact: Success by 6, United Way Service Center, 2451 Enterprise Road, Clearwater, FL 34628-1702, (813) 725-5757.*

Vaughn Next Century Learning Center, Vaughn Family Care Center
Los Angeles, CA

The Vaughn Family Care Center is the first demonstration site for the Family Care program, a collaborative project between the Los Angeles Unified School District, United Way North Angeles Region, and the Los Angeles Educational Partnership, which involves over 30 public and private agencies. The "one-stop family center," located in an elementary school with a large Latino student population and a small percentage of African-American students, provides immunizations, health screenings, nutrition classes, dental care, and mental health counseling. The center also provides access to parent education, ESL classes, child care, job training and referral, food services and family day care training and certification, youth activities, translation services, and other needed services. A Service Exchange Bank tracks services provided to families, and in exchange for the services they receive, parents provide child care, tutoring, transportation, painting, gardening, and school and community maintenance and governance. Half of the members of the commission that oversees the center are parents and the other half are service providers. Meetings are held in Spanish and English and parents play an active role in hiring and service decisions. *For more information, contact: Yoland Trevino, Project Director, 13330 Vaughn Street, San Fernando, CA 91340, (818) 834-1485, FAX (818) 834-1492.*

Promising School-to-Work Programs

Fox Cities Apprenticeship Program
Appleton, WI

This program serves students in grades 11-12 who are interested in the printing occupation. The program was started by the vice president of a large printing firm and a district school superintendent who had been involved in state-level youth apprenticeship planning efforts. Fox Cities is overseen by the Education for Employment Council, a consortium of 11 of the area's school districts, the Fox Valley Technical College, local employers, and the Fox Cities Chamber of Commerce. Participating students attend Fox Valley Technical College two days a week and participate in workplace learning the remaining three days. In addition, students spend one year rotating through a printing company, observing various aspects of the printing industry before taking on work responsibilities of their own. College credit is available for some courses and program developers are considering adding a third year to the program that would enable students to obtain an associate's degree in printing and publishing. *For more information contact: Lynn R. Peters, Director Business-Education Partnerships, Fox Cities Chamber of Commerce and Industry, 227 S. Walnut St., P.O. Box 1855, Appleton, WI 54913, (414) 734-7101.*

Oakland Health and Bioscience Academy
Oakland, CA

Oakland Technical High School's principal led the creation of the Health and Bioscience Academy with support from local hospitals and the Oakland Alliance, a community-based organization whose staff had worked with career academies. The design of the Health and Bioscience Academy was based on the Peninsula academies in a school district south of San Francisco.

Approximately 175 students participate in the program, which is open to all students. The school-within-a-school provides courses in science, English, social studies, and math. Occupational courses are linked to health and bioscience careers. Tenth graders entering the program are matched with career mentors and do 100 hours of community service in local hospitals. In eleventh grade, students rotate through a series of after-school career exploration and job-shadowing experiences. Over 90 percent are placed in a health-related work internship during the summer after eleventh grade. Approximately one-third of academy twelfth graders participate in internships after school and earn wages, school credits, or both.

The Oakland Technical High School serves inner-city students from grades 9-12; approximately 67 percent are African American and 23 percent are Asian American. *For more information contact: Patricia Clark, Director, Oakland Technical High School, 4351 Broadway, Oakland CA 94611, (510) 658-5300.*

Central Point Cluster Program
Central Point, OR

The Central Point Cluster Program serves 220 students and is open to the entire student body. Each of the program's four schools-within-a-school (business, social sciences, humanities, and ecology) was developed by a group of teachers. Integrated English, math, science, and social studies instruction are organized around the school's theme. Courses combine grade levels (10-12) and share common components such as a daily four-period block of time with the school's team of teachers; team teaching and individualized instruction; a focus on basic skills, higher-level thinking, and applied learning; and use of technology as a tool for learning. Students engage in job shadowing, weekly half-day internships, and group work-based projects.

The Central Point school district serves a rural, blue-collar, low-income, predominantly white population. *For more information contact: Crater High School, 4410 Rogue Valley Boulevard, Central Point, OR 97502, (503 664-7199.*

Fort Collins Restructured Coop
Fort Collins, CO

Professional and Career Experience (PaCE) was developed by two vocational teachers and is available in all district high schools in Fort Collins. The cornerstone of the program is a career development course students take in tenth grade. If students complete the course with a grade of C or better they are eligible to participate in paid work experience, unpaid internships, service learning, and unpaid job shadowing. Students work with counselors to identify placements of interest and participate in interviews with employers to determine work experiences. Students work in a range of fields, including high-tech electronics, health care, and the public sector. The program is open to all students in grades 10-12; its current enrollment numbers approximately 550 students from four high schools. *For more information contact: Carolyn Mason, Coordinator, Career Education and School-to-Work, Professional and Career Experience (PaCE), Poudre School District, 2407 LaPorte Avenue, Fort Collins, CO 80521, (970) 490-3652.*

Aviation High School
New York, NY

Aviation High School is the only high school in the United States designed to prepare students for careers in aviation-related fields. The school's 1,600 students can specialize in aviation mechanics and engineering while obtaining a strong academic education. Students are encouraged to take higher-level courses in science, mathematics, English, and social studies. Upon graduation, students can receive diplomas and certificates from New York State, New York City, the Federal Aviation Administration, and the Federal Communications Commission upon graduation. Course offerings change periodically in response to New York State and aviation industry requirements. An on-site hanger of 20 airplanes and various aviation equipment provides intensive exposure to the aviation industry and hands-on experience for students. *For more information, contact: Aviation High School, 45-30 36th Street & Queens Bldg., Long Island City, NY 11101, (718) 361-2032.*

Goose Creek Independent School District
Baytown, TX

The goal of this K-12 initiative—"Authentic Connections"—is to prepare students to graduate with a clear career objective and pursue college or technical training. The program's curriculum emphasizes rigorous coursework and applied learning. Activities for students in grades K-5 emphasize career awareness and hands-on activities. Students in grades 6-8 take applied academics and are exposed to the work world through career exploration and interest assessments. Additionally, each student develops an individual educational career plan to prepare for career-specific courses in high school. Once in high school, students must choose one of six general career majors: health services, human services, engineering and industrial technology, business, environmental/agricultural sciences, or liberal arts. The district's Tech Prep curricula prepares students for study at Lee College in business, drafting, data processing, machine shop, electronics, welding, or aerospace technology. The district maintains strong ties at all grade levels with area parents, community members, postsecondary institutions, and business and industry leaders. *For more information, contact: Dr. Harry Griffith, Superintendent, Goose Creek Independent School District, P.O. Box 30, Baytown, TX 77522, (713) 420-4800.*

Leander Independent School District
Leander, TX

Leander was one of the first districts in Texas to use "2 + 2" (2 years of high school + 2 years of postsecondary education) programs. The district started a "2 + 2" program in 1985 to train students as instrumentation and control technicians for Austin's growing electronics market. Three high school courses and additional training provided by Austin Community College were developed to train the students. Leander ISD, a member of the Capital Area Tech Prep Consortium, recruits students for tech prep as they enter ninth grade. *For more information, contact: Steve Jeske, Leander Independent School District, P. O. Box 218, Leander, TX 78646-0218, (512) 259-4201.*

Becoming a COMMUNITY OF LEARNERS:

Emerging Leadership Practices

***AS LEADERS,** we play a crucial role in selecting the melody, setting the tempo, establishing the key, and inviting the players. But that is all we can do. The music comes from something we cannot direct, from a unified whole created among the players — a relational holism that transcends separateness. In the end, when it works, we sit back, amazed and grateful.*

Margaret J. Wheatley,
from *Leadership and the New Science*
(1992)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The following questions will help you reflect on your leadership and practices in your school. This checklist has the benefits and limits of all checklists. While comprehensive, it cannot cover all of the special issues that make up the unique context of your school. This checklist that we offer is not provided with the intention of making you feel guilt or shame at what you're not doing. Rather we have designed this checklist to stimulate your thinking about what you are doing and what you might consider doing in the future. Thus, we view this checklist as a catalyst for flexible action, rather than as a straitjacket to make you conform to an image of the "good principal".

Lynn J. Stinnette, Director, Urban Education, NCREL
with Kent Peterson, University of Wisconsin, Madison, and Philip Hallinger, Vanderbilt University

Ways of Leading and Managing	*always*	*frequently*	*sometimes*	*never*
Have we worked together to articulate a shared purpose and educational vision focused on learning?	○	○	○	○
Do leaders protect the vision and make it visible to others?	○	○	○	○
Do leaders communicate their values and mission in the things they do, how they spend their time, and what they consider important?	○	○	○	○
Do we take collective responsibility for school practices and outcomes?	○	○	○	○
Do leaders in our school emphasize power through people rather than power over people?	○	○	○	○
Is authority in our school based more on professional knowledge and competence than on position and rules?	○	○	○	○
Do leaders in our school facilitate, guide, and coach others to adopt practices that advance student performance? academic and social?	○	○	○	○
Do leaders provide social support for high academic achievement?	○	○	○	○
Do leaders communicate their passion for learning by challenging ineffective practices?	○	○	○	○
Do leaders create a culture that supports risk–taking and encourages innovation?	○	○	○	○

Approaches to Problem Solving and Decision Making	*always*	*frequently*	*sometimes*	*never*
Are discussion and inquiry common and accepted practices in our school?	○	○	○	○
Do we share information and make decisions together?	○	○	○	○
Do we solve problems collaboratively?	○	○	○	○
Are we open to multiple approaches and solutions rather than reliance on single answers and past practices?	○	○	○	○
Do leaders try to gain many points of view before solving important problems?	○	○	○	○
Is decision making consensual and inclusive as opposed to top–down and nonparticipatory?	○	○	○	○
Do leaders provide formal and informal means for staff and students to raise and solve problems in the school?	○	○	○	○
Do leaders accept conflict as "normal" and use it as a stimulus for change, or is it viewed as "bad" and something simply to be controlled?	○	○	○	○

Concerning Learning	*always*	*frequently*	*sometimes*	*never*
Are learning goals clear, understood, and accepted?	○	○	○	○
Do leaders protect academic time and support teachers in keeping students engaged in learning?	○	○	○	○
Do students acquire essential skills and knowledge at high levels?	○	○	○	○
Do we engage students as active learners and co–constructors of knowledge?	○	○	○	○
Do classroom practices develop thinking skills for all children rather than emphasize rote acquisition of basic skills?	○	○	○	○
Do classroom practices provide opportunities to apply and use knowledge in a variety of contexts?	○	○	○	○
Do we provide opportunities for students to direct and be responsible for their own learning?	○	○	○	○
Do we use cooperative learning groups and other alternative methods rather than relying solely on independent work and competition?	○	○	○	○
Are some learning experiences interdisciplinary?	○	○	○	○
Do learning experiences in our school incorporate resources outside of the classroom?	○	○	○	○
Do we use valid, multiple assessments to gauge student learning and progress?	○	○	○	○
Is there time and support for professional development that improves curriculum, instruction, and student learning?	○	○	○	○
Do leaders model life–long learning for others by sharing new learning, successes, and failures?	○	○	○	○

Structural Conditions	*always*	*frequently*	*sometimes*	*never*
Are roles in our school flexible and interdependent rather than rigid and hierarchical?	○	○	○	○
Do teachers have considerable autonomy and discretion to plan curriculum and organize instruction within an overall framework?	○	○	○	○
Do we use teams to plan and implement school improvement?	○	○	○	○
Are there opportunities for dialogue and planning across teams, grades, and subjects?	○	○	○	○
Is communication in our school open and fluid as opposed to regulated by traditional chains of command?	○	○	○	○
Do we create small, "communal" arrangements that personalize learning and maximize student–teacher and student–student interaction?	○	○	○	○
Do we create an environment that is safe, supportive, and conducive to learning?	○	○	○	○
Relating to the Community				
Do we encourage widescale participation of stakeholders parents, community members, and students?	○	○	○	○
Do we empower parents and community members to participate in decisions about our school?	○	○	○	○
Do we forge partnerships with community organizations, agencies, and businesses to address the needs of children and families?	○	○	○	○
Are we linking a variety of health and human services to our school?	○	○	○	○
Are local businesses involved with our school?	○	○	○	○

Based on the following resources

Barth, R. S. (1990). *Improving schools from within.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Fullan, M. G. (1993). *Change forces.* Bristol, PA: Falmer Press.

Fullan, M. G. (1993). *What's worth fighting for in the principalship.* Toronto: Ontario Public School Teachers' Federation.

Fullan, M. & Hargreaves, A. (1991). *What's worth fighting for? Working together for your school.* Toronto: Ontario Public School Teachers' Federation.

Fullan, M. G., & Miles, M. B. (1992). Getting reform right: What works and what doesn't. *Phi Delta Kappan, 73*(10), 745–752.

Lee, V. E. & Smith, J. B. (1994, Fall). High school restructuring and student achievement: A new study finds strong links. In *Issues in Restructuring Schools* (pp. 1–5,16). Madison, WI: National Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools, University of Wisconsin.

Lieberman, A., Falk, B., & Alexander, L. (1995). A culture in the making: Leadership in learner-centered schools. In J. Oakes & K. Hunter Quartz (Eds.), *Creating new educational communities* (pp. 108–129). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Leithwood, K. A. (1992). The move toward transformational leadership. *Educational Leadership, 45*(5), 8–12.

Leithwood, K. & Aitken, R. (1995). *Making schools smarter.* Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Murphy, J. (1992). *The landscape of leadership preparation.* Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Murphy J., & Hallinger, P. (Eds.). (1993). *Restructuring schooling: Learning from ongoing efforts.* Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Newmann, F. & Wehlage, G. (1995). *Successful school restructuring.* Madison, WI: Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools.

Peterson, K., & Deal, T. (1993). Strategies for building school cultures: Principals as symbolic leaders. In M. Sashkin & H. Walberg (Eds.), *Educational leadership and school culture* (pp.89–99). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishers.

Saphier, J. & King, M. (1985). Good seeds grow in strong cultures. *Educational Leadership, 42*(6), 67–74.

Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline.* New York, NY: Doubleday.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1992). Why we should seek substitutes for leadership. *Educational Leadership, 45*(5), 41–45.

Wheatley, M. J. (1992). *Leadership and the new science.* San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

North Central Regional Educational Laboratory
1900 Spring Road, Suite 300
Oak Brook, Illinois 60521-1480
800/356-2735
FAX: 708/571-4716

Community Collaboration and Social Capital: An Interview With Gary G. Wehlage

by Anne Turnbaugh Lockwood

What is the meaning of "social capital" — and what potential does it have to improve education, neighborhoods, and the lives of families? What common obstacles block successful implementation of communitywide collaborative efforts? Why isn't school-community collaboration more widely advocated and practiced? We raised these and other questions with Gary G. Wehlage, Professor of Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Wisconsin — Madison. Wehlage has been Associate Director of two federally-funded research centers: the National Center on Effective Secondary Schools and the Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools. Formerly a high school history and economics teacher, he has been involved in teacher education and the development of alternative schools for at-risk youth. As a key part of the research team that evaluated the New Futures Project of the Annie E. Casey Foundation — in which five cities received $50 million over five years to implement collaborative efforts — he was responsible for evaluating the process of school reform in the cities and advising the Foundation on the promise and problems of large-scale reform efforts. He is the co-author of A Guide to Authentic Instruction and Assessment: Vision, Standards, and Scoring *(with Walter Secada and Fred M. Newmann) and* Successful School Restructuring: A Report to the Public and Educators *(with Fred M. Newmann). His research on school-community collaboration, which is designed to meet the needs of disadvantaged youth, has led to the problem of developing social capital in neighborhoods, communities, and schools.*

A fundamental problem facing schools and communities, Gary Wehlage believes, is the erosion of trust between people that has resulted from years of adversarial relationships between schools, social service agencies, and families — particularly in the inner cities of the United States. Although it might sound impossible to nurture trust among the cynical and disaffected, Wehlage emphasizes that the framework of "social capital" is the goal of productive, collaborative relationships geared toward the common good.

To what does the term "social capital" refer — and why is it the ultimate goal of school-community collaboration? In his reply, Wehlage first refers to the work of sociologist James Coleman, who described three forms of capital: human, financial, and social.

"Financial capital is based on money," Wehlage begins, "whereas human capital is the stock of knowledge and skills individuals have, based on what their education or experience has given them."

He adds, "Educators are interested mainly in increasing the human capital stock, because that is what formal education is all about."

Social capital, a more elusive concept than the other forms of capital, refers to the quality of the relationships among and between people. "Unlike the other two forms of capital, social capital is not possessed in the way that knowledge or money is possessed," he explains. "Social capital adheres in the set of relationships among people — and those relationships are productive to the extent that they are based on a common set of expectations, a set of

shared values, and a sense of trust among people. Where social capital is weak, there are conflicting values and a significant lack of trust."

For example, within a school a lack of social capital can be seen if people have abandoned hope of working as a team, where individual goals are pursued without thought of the collective good, and where the quality of relationships among staff at best is superficially cordial — without any deeper bonding or trust that colleagues can be relied upon or even that they share a common philosophy.

The Power of Social Capital

"If collaboration is such a good idea, why is it so hard to do?"

What is the potential power of social capital? In what ways can productive relationships between people dissolve persistent barriers between institutions so that they can work toward a collectively agreed-upon common good? "When people trust each other," Wehlage responds, "and when they share values, expectations, and goals, they are in a position to organize themselves to achieve some collective goals — a common purpose.

"What often happens in inner cities in America — although this is true increasingly all across America — is that the level of trust between people has declined so that people are more and more isolated. They are suspicious of their fellow citizens because they don't think they share their values or their expectations. As a result, they withdraw from relationships into isolation so there is no collaborative effort toward anything."

Social capital can be conceptualized in two forms: place-based social capital and social capital that rests on a foundation of professional standards and ethics. "The place-based type of social capital is the old-fashioned notion of community," Wehlage explains. "People lived close to each other, they saw each other in face-to-face relations. They may not always have liked each other but they trusted each other — trust in the sense that they shared fundamental values."

Professional social capital is facilitated by a set of uniform standards among those in an occupation and, increasingly, by technology. "For example," he notes, "I receive articles by mail written by colleagues at other universities around the country with the request that I review what they have produced. A clear set of standards, expectations, and values governs this type of peer review; people trust me to give a fair, impartial review about whether these articles are suitable for publication.

"Although lawyers fight in court all the time, there is a set of standards that the American Bar Association employs. The same is true for physicians. All professionals have this type of social capital, and it transcends any particular place like a neighborhood or a small town. It also increases constantly as people interact with e-mail and other forms of modern technology. In other words, it is possible to develop and maintain productive working relationships among people who have never met face-to-face."

How does the concept of social capital affect education reform efforts that call for school-community collaboration? "In education," Wehlage points out, "one of the problems all over American is that the place-based type of social capital is declining. Although people live close to each other, they don't know each other. This is classic in suburbs."

He continues, "Goleman pointed out in his book on Catholic schools that even through parents don't necessarily live close to each other, they send their children to the same school and know each other through their relationships in the church and the school. They share a set of expectations and values, and they reinforce those both consciously and

unconsciously — consciously in that they choose to send their children to Catholic schools and unconsciously in that through their culture and daily living they reinforce a common set of values and expectations."

This consistency of values, norms, and expectations — fueled by the naturally-occurring relationships among parents — has a powerful effect on youth. "Catholic schools have a lower dropout rate than public schools, when controlled for socioeconomic status and other variables."

Wehlage asks, "How do you explain this type of success? As a partial explanation, Coleman uses the theory of social capital, saying that the power of these relationships supports academic achievement."

Although Wehlage is quick to point out that the concept of social capital is somewhat new and "admittedly somewhat fuzzy," he emphasizes that there is a growing belief among researchers, policymakers, and the general public that distrust — which produces a lack of organization among neighborhood residents — is a common problem that afflicts inner cities and, increasingly, suburbs.

"The parents who send their children to the same school in a neighborhood are unsuccessful in building a set of shared norms, expectations, and values about school because of this lack of organization and absence of intimate relations," he says. "However, we must remember that this is a hypothesis, not a concrete finding based on empirical research."

Building Social Capital

Educators frequently remark that it is very difficult for adults in a school — who ostensibly are there because of common beliefs and goals about education — to agree what their common purpose should be and how to achieve it. Is it possible to seek positive relationships that will include not only educators but also staff of social service agencies — or does that scenario further complicate efforts toward educational reform?

"It is possible," Wehlage says firmly. "In the best of all possible worlds, community members would participate to a high degree in all aspects of their community life. Service organizations such as welfare would find many better ways to involve the people they serve in decision-making and in the formation of policy. In the worst-case scenario, social service professionals sit in their offices in high-rise buildings in the city and dispense forms. They don't have much interaction with clients, and the interaction that they do have leads to distrust on the part of community members."

In his role as a key researcher for the New Futures Project of the Annie E. Casey Foundation, in which five cities tried to implement ambitious agendas that not only linked the schools with social service agencies but tried to involve community members in setting social policy, Wehlage observed first-hand the difficulties of successful collaboration. He asks dryly, "If collaboration is such a good idea, why is it so hard to do?"

Lessons can be learned from the Beacons Project in New York City, he maintains. "The Beacons are neighborhood organizations premised on a high degree of citizen involvement in the formulation, administration, and delivery of services. That is, the Beacons have a decision-making structure that is dominated by the local residents. Through this structure they sometimes decide to use people from the neighborhood to provide services to people who otherwise would receive the same services from professionals."

He adds, "This, of course, has irritated the professional community. In that sense, it hasn't always built collaboration between the residents of a community and

"Social capital adheres in the set of relationships among people and those relationships are productive to the extent that they are based on a common set of expectations, a set of shared values, and a sense of trust among people."

the professionals who work in social service agencies. However, the sense of ownership of the Beacons is high among community residents. They feel that it is their organization as opposed to something such as the New Futures projects in which a plan frequently was imposed upon community residents by a planning council of well-intentioned leaders. Even if these were good ideas the local residents sometimes felt: 'Who asked us?'"

Collaboration and Achievement

While it is readily apparent that school-community collaboration might improve social well-being, what is its link to academic achievement?

"The link to achievement begins with the deprivation assumption," Wehlage responds, "which holds that inner-city kids in particular come to school deprived of health care, good food, and opportunities outside of school — and sometimes opportunities inside school. If these are provided, kids will have both the initiative and the reason to achieve as well as have all these other needs satisfied.

"It is a good hypothesis," Wehlage says carefully, " but it is hard to find a cause and effect relationship. Can you imagine the research methodology that would be required? You would have to have an experiment with matched kids and comparable schools, a treatment program compared to no treatment, and a long period of time to see whether anything significant was accomplished."

To Wehlage, his research and programmatic evaluations of school-community collaboration support the notion that the most promising models, such as the Beacons in New York City, do not operate from a deficit model but instead strive to be a normal part of a community — in which positive relationships develop in a natural way and are not solely based on need. "The successful programs try to serve youth in general instead of identifying who is at risk and who is not at risk and then only serve those labeled at risk. Why not just serve them all?"

While top-down, bureaucratic models of collaboration are probably the easiest to implement, they are ultimately the least successful. "What we have observed is that it is common for an initiative to work bureaucratically," Wehlage says, "and hire a director who has lots of money at his disposal. He or she then hires professionals to come in from outside and do therapy with some kids who are having problems. In that way, it is easier to implement some types of collaboration, but they are not successful — and may even be destructive."

Returning to the Beacons Project in New York City, he illustrates how a model that is the opposite of a bureaucratic model can succeed. "The Beacons are housed in the school but they almost ignore the school. They are open seven days a week, 18 hours a day. They provide a place, an occasion, and an opportunity for a lot of activities to occur. In a way, they function like old-fashioned community centers.

"One of their best features is that they are not designed solely for kids, and they are not just places for the halt, the lame, and the sick. That is the problem with too many of these efforts," he notes. "Who wants to go to the clinic if it is only for kids who are pregnant or have something wrong with them? If you create a different environment, everybody wants to come to it."

Although people with specific problems certainly partake of the services provided by the Beacons, others come to play basketball or cards. Teachers are not involved directly other than providing referrals for after-school tutoring. "One weakness of some programs," Wehlage observes, "is that they demand that teach-

"Who wants to go to the clinic if it is only for kids who are pregnant or have something wrong with them? If you create a different environment, everybody wants to come to it."

"The successful programs try to serve youth in general instead of identifying who is at risk and who is not at risk and then only serve those labeled at risk. Why not just serve them all?"

ers have some skills and sensitivity to work with kids or to work with kids in tandem with social service professionals. In great programs, this practice succeeds because they hand-select their teachers, people who have special skills. But in the average school, perhaps 90 percent of the teachers are unwilling to do this or incompetent without a lot of extra training. Some people are determined to teach math, not worry about the kids' problems — and there is little one can do to change that attitude."

Programs such as the Beacons do what Wehlage calls "an end run" — acknowledging the importance of academics and deliberately locating themselves in the school as the symbolic and practical hub of the community, but looking beyond the scope of the school to provide a multitude of other services and activities for all ages.

Another positive aspect of the Beacons, Wehlage says, is that programmatically the project illustrates social capital at its optimum. "Naturally occurring relationships are created among people by having this center serve as sort of an ongoing recreational, educational, and therapeutic center. People who get together to play checkers are doing what they normally do, but the activity reinforces a set of relationships that can last beyond the moment of that game."

Overcoming Obstacles to Collaboration

Can school-community collaborative efforts have any negative effects? "If done poorly or insensitively," Wehlage replies, "these collaborations tend to further the cynicism and exasperation that people have with public services and with schools — and deepens their rejection of government. I remember one woman who said: 'It is always the same. People come with these ideas and they get us started and then they stop. They don't deliver.'"

Certain pitfalls in implementing school-community collaborative efforts can be avoided, however, Wehlage believes. "We identified some generalized obstacles to success. One is slippage: the inevitable and imperfect implementation of collaboration between school and community services. Each agency has its own accountability system in the political arena in which it has to operate. Often the officials at the ground level respond to political pressures on them that undermine collaboration.

These political pressures can impede collaboration quite significantly, he believes. "For example, counselors at a school and social workers at an agency often clash because they have different views of their responsibilities, even though at a more general level they have agreed that having both counselors and social workers work with kids is a good idea. Social workers come in and see the school creating obstacles for the kids and are very critical of the school's efforts. Counselors then become entrenched in a defensive mode about the school and its procedures. From that standpoint, collaboration is very difficult."

Another obstacle can be the quality of the interaction between and among school and social services personnel: adversarial and competitive rather than cooperative. "In Savannah, for example," Wehlage remembers, "we had an ongoing battle between members of the Black community and the school system. The issue was the dropout and suspension rate. Savannah had extremely high dropout rates at the middle and high school levels. Advocates for African American children would look at these statistics and say, 'Why are you treating these kids so badly?' The school would say, 'We are obligated to maintain law and order in our buildings and these kids are acting up. We can't tolerate disruptive behavior. How can the well-behaved kids learn if other kids disrupt the classroom?'

"This is an example of a quasi-political stance. The school is defending itself and its right to throw out the malcontents. The advocates are criticizing them because they are asking what will happen to these kids. Will they end up on the streets? Even

"In the best of all possible worlds, community members would participate to a high degree in all aspects of their community life. Service organizations such as welfare would find many better ways to involve the people they serve in decisionmaking and in the formation of policy. In the worst-case scenario, social service professionals sit in their offices in high-rise buildings in the city and dispense forms."

though everyone has agreed at some point that collaboration and working together is the only way to solve these problems, the fighting broke out constantly on this issue. Both sides were right in their own ways."

Leadership and Collaboration

What type of leadership facilitates collaboration? "Different people could function as leaders," Wehlage says. "The school superintendent, if he or she is the right superintendent, could take leadership for the collaboration. A mayor could do it or a county executive. My preference, however, is that someone who is widely respected in the community takes the initiative."

A common mistake is to think of one person exclusively as the leader, he points out. "In Savannah, three people functioned collaboratively as leaders. One was a very successful businessman, whose family had been in business in the city for several generations. He functioned as the titular head of the New Futures initiative, although his main activity was giving speeches at Rotary or handing out awards.

"However," Wehlage emphasizes, "his activities always made the newspapers because he was both a successful businessman and a social leader. This was important because it gave the initiative citywide visibility.

"The second key leader was the city manager, best known for getting the downtown area refurbished and restored, which brought in tourism and business. He was seen as a business-oriented city manager concerned about property values, but he also was committed to doing something about youth in the community. He realized that if something positive didn't occur, the city would crumble socially.

"The third leader was born and raised in the ghetto of Savannah and became a professor of sociology at Savannah State, resigning his professorship to head up the New Futures initiative. He had great credibility in the Black community but he was also respected in the White community. These three people provided leadership, and it is the best practical example I can provide. Of course, these three people had to have a harmonious relationship and they did."

However, as carefully crafted as the New Futures leadership in Savannah was, it still encountered a key stumbling block. "Getting the cooperation of the school was difficult," Wehlage says. "The district went through a series of superintendents, all of whom felt they were under attack by the community for not doing an adequate job. This attitude resulted in a certain amount of strain and tension, which was always present."

"We saw that when New Futures worked the best in cities, it came about as a result of realizing that we are all in the same boat," Wehlage reflects. "We are all out on the high seas together. There is no place to hide anymore. The community, the school, the kids, and all races and ethnicities are in this boat together. We have to figure out a way to create a good future for all kids so the community itself can prosper and sustain itself."

But social capital remains the goal toward which all collaborative efforts must strive, Wehlage believes. "The issue," he says, "is whether whole communities can build relationships that transcend the narrow interests of individuals or single groups to encompass the broad interests of families, neighborhoods, and entire communities."

"We have to figure out a way to create a good future for all kids so the community itself can prosper and sustain itself."

Gary G. Wehlage

SELECTED EMERGING REFORMS

ATLAS Communities Project (Authentic Teaching, Learning, and Assessment for All Students)

Project ATLAS signals something new in educational reform: a collaborative effort between reforms, connected by the ideas of four of the most prominent figures in reform: James P. Comer (the Yale University psychologist who established the School Development Program), Howard Gardner (the Harvard University psychologist who developed the Multiple Intelligences Theory), Theodore R. Sizer (director of the Coalition of Essential Schools and the Annenberg Institute of Education Reform), and Janet Whitla (leader of the Education Development Center, a prominent research-and-development project). Project ATLAS, funded by the New American Schools Development Corporation, pulls the ground-breaking ideas of these four individuals and their programs into one school improvement program, which is being tested in three states. The schools and districts that belong to the ATLAS Communities are grounded on a foundation of five principles:

- Authentic teaching and learning is driven by questions; focuses on habits and understanding; and involves challenging, purposeful, and sustained work
- Ongoing cycles of planning, action, and reflection characterize effective teaching, learning, assessment, and organizational change
- Relationships matter because learning is a social activity
- Shared leadership, commitment, and communication build a collaborative culture of learning
- Members of ATLAS schools see themselves as part of broader, more integrated learning communities (*Education Week*, July 12, 1995)

For more information, contact:
The ATLAS Communities Project
Education Development Center
55 Chapel Street
Newton, MA 02158
(617) 969-7100

Turning Points

In 1989, the Carnegie Task Force on Education of Young Adolescents issued *Turning Points: Preparing American Youth for the 21st Century*. This report tells how to make schools developmentally appropriate for young adolescents and, at the same time, become inclusive, supportive communities. The report presents a comprehensive agenda for overhauling middle-grade education based on eight principles. These principles include making middle schools places where close trusting relationships with adults and peers create a climate for students' personal and intellectual growth; teaching a core curriculum that integrates subjects thematically and promotes thinking and problem solving; and empowering teachers through governance and curriculum planning committees.

The Carnegie Corporation has committed resources to support these recommendations through the Middle Grade Schools State Policy Initiative (MGSSPI) which currently engages 15 states. Twelve schools in the MGSSPI participate in longitudinal case

studies conducted by researchers Jeannie Oakes and Gretchen Guiton.

For more information about Turning Points and the Middle Grade Schools State Policy Initiative, consult the following:

Carnegie Countil on Adolescent *Development (1990). Turning points: preparing American youth for the 21st century: Recommendations for transforming middle grade schools.* New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Oakes, J., & Guiton, G. (1995). Teaming: Creating small communities of learners in middle grades. In J. Oakes & K. Hunter Quartz (Eds.), Creating new *educational communities* (pp. 87-107). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

The Small Schools Movement

A common complaint about today's schools is that they are just too big. Not only are oversized schools a management nightmare, but children get lost in the shuffle. A growing body of evidence suggests that reducing school size will improve student outcomes. This evidence is stimulating educators to look at ways to create smaller, more personal learning environments inside of schools.

Perhaps the most famous such effort is the Central Park East schools in New York, where "schools within school" restructuring dates back some 15 years. But in Philadelphia, Los Angeles, Chicago and elsewhere, teachers and parents are looking at new ways to reorganize schools. Data collected by researchers at the Universities of Michigan, Wisconsin, and Illinois suggest that small school size not only improves student performance on grades and test scores, but lowers drop-out rates, reduces violence and drug abuse. These outcomes improve with reduction in school size, researchers agree, regardless of other restructuring and reform measures taken.

A common definition of "small schools" has evolved within this community of educators and researchers. Among the characteristics of the new small schools are a maximum population of 250-300 students, mixed heterogeneously, and a cohesive, self-selected faculty. Democracy is an important ingredient in the recipe for small schools, with a high degree of autonomy around issues like curriculum, selection of leaders, and assessment. Successful small schools demonstrate a non-exclusive admissions policy, offering students a continuous educational experience (e.g., K-6, 6-8, 9-12).

For additional information about the small schools movement, contact:

Midge Richardson, Executive Director
Center for Educational Innovation
52 Vanderbilt Avenue, 2nd Floor
New York, NY 10017
(212) 599-7000

Bill Ayers and Pat Ford, Co-Directors
Small Schools Workshops
College of Education
University of Illinois at Chicago
115 South Sangamon, Third Floor
Chicago, IL 60607
(312) 413-8066

Anne Hallett, Executive Director
Cross-City Campaign for Urban School Reform
407 S. Dearborn, Suite 1725
Chicago, IL 60605
(312)322-4880

NCREL

Additional Resources: School-linked, Integrated Services

Building Villages to Raise Our Children: From Programs to Service Systems
by Heather Weiss, Arlie Woodrum, M. Elena Lopez, and Jacqueline Kraemer, 1993

This booklet examines family support programs and service delivery systems. The authors discuss the evolution of the family support movement, organizing principles for family support and service delivery, and the stages of program and service system development. The publication endorses a service delivery system based on an integrated "village" approach rather than a series of disconnected service programs. From *Programs to Service Systems* is part of the ***Building Villages to Raise Children*** series which also includes the publications on *Collaboration, Funding and Resources, Evaluation, Community Outreach, and Staffing. Available from: The Harvard Family Research Project, Longfellow Hall, Appian Way, Cambridge, MA 02138, (617) 495-9108.*

Charting a Course: Assessing a Community's Strengths and Needs
by Charles Bruner, Karen Bell, Claire Brindis, Hedy Chang, and William Scarbrough, 1993

This resource brief is based on a review of existing guides to conducting community assessments; state, county, and neighborhood reports on child and family well-being; surveys and focus group reports examining the views of children; and selected assessments produced by communities that have been effective in shaping community initiatives. Throughout, illustrations from specific community assessments show the different ways assessment results can be used to help shape community actions. *Available from: The National Center for Service Integration c/o Mathtec, Inc., 5111 Leesburg Pike, Ste. 702, Falls Church, VA 22041, (703) 824-7447.*

Drawing Strength from Diversity
by Hedy Chang, 1994

This report explores strategies for incorporating issues of race, language, and culture into each stage of a reform process to support disadvantaged children and their families. The report is based on the results of a 1993 survey of 98 collaborative programs in California, site visits to seven collaborative programs (six in California and one in Colorado), a literature review, and indepth interviews with persons involved with collaborative reform efforts throughout the nation. The report discuss the connection between human-service reforms initiatives and issues of diversity; the use of community needs assessments to involve diverse community members and identify community strengths and resources; and staff development, organizational changes, and governance strategies for addressing the needs of diverse children and families. *Available from: California Tomorrow, Fort Mason Center, Building B, San Francisco, CA 94123, (415) 441-7631.*

Full-service schools: A revolution in health and social services for children, youth, and families.
by Joy Dryfoos, 1994

This book addresses the need for schools to employ the resources of families, communities, and social service agencies in meeting the academic, social, emotional, and physical needs of students. Chapters explore the challenges and rationale for creating full-service schools, historical antecedents to today's full-service schools, existing school-based service programs, evaluation of school-based service programs, organizational and service delivery issues, and funding issues. The final chapter is a call to action for educators and community members. The book closes with three appendices featuring twelve states that are supporting school-based services, a list of federal sources for funding school-based services, and a glossary of acronyms. *Available from: Jossey-Bass Publishers, Jossey-Bass Publishers, 350 Sansome Street, San Francisco, CA 94104, (415) 433-1767.*

The Future of Children: School Linked Services, Center for the Future of Children
The David and Lucile Packard Foundation, Spring 1992

The authors provide an overview of the complex proposal for schools to play a significantly increased role in the coordination and/or provision of health and social services to children and families. Issues of financing, evaluation, and confidentiality are among the key issues addressed in this edition of the *Future of Children. Available from: The David and Lucile Packard Foundation, The Center for the Future of Children, 300 Second Street, Suite 102, Los Altos, CA 94022, (415) 948-3696.*

Putting Families First: America's Family Support Movement and the Challenge of Change
by Sharon L. Kagan and Bernice Weissbourd, Eds., 1994

This publication examines the historical foundations of family support programs. The book outlines some of the necessary institutional, programmatic, and policy changes and challenges associated with creating and sustaining family support systems. Researchers explore the family support movement as it effects schools, churches, prisons, and the workplace. *Available from: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, 350 Sansome Street, San Francisco, CA 94104, (415) 433-1767.*

School/community collaboration: Comparing three initiatives
by Calvin Stone, 1995

In this article, Stone examines three kinds of school/community collaboration developed in San Diego and discusses the strengths and limitations of each. *Available from: Phi Delta Kappan, Box 789, Bloomington, IN 47402-0789, (812) 339-1156.*

School/family/community partnerships: Caring for the children we share
by Joyce L. Epstein, 1995

This article discusses both the research on school/family/community partnerships and how they work in the practice. Epstein presents a framework for six types of involvement and provides sample practices for each. The article concludes with specific steps for establishing partnerships, characteristics of successful programs, and next steps. *Available from: Phi Delta Kappan, Box 789, Bloomington, IN 47402-0789, (812) 339-1156*

School-linked services: Appraisal, financing, and future directions
by Michael Kirst, 1994

This paper was prepared for an AERA/OERI Conference on School Linked Services, held in September 1994 in Leesburg, VA. Kirst argues for the benefits of school linked

services and based on current research presents five major components needed to optimize school linked efforts. This paper also discusses ways to fund school linked services by using existing allocations in federal initiatives such as ESEA, Medicaid, and the Family Support Act of 1988.

School-linked services and Chapter 1: A new approach to improving outcomes for children.
by Michael Kirst, Julia Koppich, and Carolyn Kelley, 1994
In M. Wang, & K. Wong, (Eds.), *Rethinking policy for at-risk students.*

This chapter presents a rationale for creating sustainable school-linked services programs by connecting them to schoolwide improvement efforts supported by Chapter 1. The authors offer strategies and recommend changes in chapter 1 procedures to better serve children. The chapter also delineates a comprehensive approach to service delivery, discusses barriers to school-linked integrated services, and describes federal level initiatives to connect Chapter 1 and school-linked services. *Available from: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, P.O. Box 774, Berkeley, CA 94701.*

Thinking collaboratively: Ten questions and answers to help policy makers improve children's services
by Charles Bruner, April 1991

This document uses a question-and-answer format to help state and local policymakers consider how best to foster local collaboration that truly benefits children and families. Checklists are provided to help policymakers quickly assess key issues in establishing interagency initiatives, demonstration projects, and statewide reforms to foster collaboration. *Available from: Institute for Educational Leadership, 1001 Connecticut Ave., NW, Ste. 310, Washington, DC 20036-5541, (202) 822-8405.*

Together We Can: A guide For Crafting a Profamily System of Education and Human Services
by Atelia I. Melaville and Martin J. Blank, with Gelareh Asayesh, April 1993

This report, written by staff members of the Center for the Study of Social Policy and the Institute for Educational Leadership, is a guide to the process of collaboration "for communities interested in creating a profamily system of integrated services to address the complicated problems children and families face in today's society." The document covers issues of visioning, planning, needs assessment, and team building and includes a number of tools to assist readers in creating partnerships to support students and their families. *Available from: OERI, U.S. Department of Education, ATTN: Susan Talley, 555 New Jersey Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20208-5644, (202) 219-2129.*

What It Takes: Structuring Interagency Partnerships to Connect Children and Families with Comprehensive Services
by Atelia Melaville, with Martin Blank, January 1991

This publication discusses key issues and obstacles in linking comprehensive services to schools. The authors provide readers with guidelines for establishing successful school-linked, integrated service programs. This booklet also highlights successful school-linked, integrated service programs throughout the nation. The document concludes with a listing of organizations and readings that address issues of interagency collaboration and service provision. *Available from: Education and Human Services, c/o the Institute for Educational Leadership (IEL), 1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 310, Washington, DC 20036-5541, (202) 822-8405.*

Additional Resources: School-to-Work

Benson, C. S. (1993). School to work transition: What is it? Do we need it? How do we obtain it? How will we know if it is effective? *Journal of Texas Public Education, 1(4), 1-12.*

In this article, Benson looks at the federal government's thoughts on school-to-work transition, provides a rationale for implementing school-to-work initiatives throughout the country, recommends steps for putting a school-to-work transition system into place, and outlines criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of such efforts.

Bissett, D. (1993). School-to-work transition: Implementing a critical work force preparation strategy. *Journal of Texas Public Education,* 1(4), 13-18.

This article outlines the key components of a school-to-work strategy, including quality work force planning, curriculum development, professional development, career guidance, assessment, certification, follow-up, and employment of skilled graduates. A scenario of a fictitious student's elementary, middle, high school, and college years illustrates the desired outcome of Bissett's proposed strategy.

Charner, I., Fraser, B. S., Hubbard, S., Rogers, A., & Horne, R. (1995). Reforms of the school-to-work transition: Findings, implications, and challenges. *Phi Delta Kappan,* 77(1), 40, 58-60.

This article details findings of the Academy for Educational Development's National Institute for Work and Learning (NIWL), which conducted a study of 14 school-to-work sties. Based on its observations and interviews, the Institute identified and summarized ten key elements of successful school-to-work initiatives. Dedicated administrative leadership, committed program developers, and cross-sector collaboration were common among successful school-to-work sites. Researchers also found that successful initiatives worked to foster self-determination in all students, to implement school- and work-based learning, to integrate career information and guidence, to build a progressive system starting before grade 11, to ensure access to postsecondary options, and to use creative financing strategies.

Commission on skills in the American workforce. (1990). *America's choice: High skills or low wages.* Rochester, NY: National Center for Education and the Economy.

This report outlines how America's best companies are retooling themselves for increased competitiveness in the world economy and argues that despite these efforts, few are investing in human resources to support these changes. It details a number of challenges that stand in the way of the development of a highly educated workforce in the U. S. and makes recommendations for enhancing key aspects of national, state, and local educational systems to address these challenges.

Glover, R. W. (1993). School-to-work transition: An essential component of effective school reform. *Journal of Texas Public Education,* 1(4), 29-40.

This article argues that school-to-work transition is essential for successful school reform. According to Glover, linking school-to-work, which tends to emphasize learning-by-doing, leads to more active student participation in the learning process, greater engagement, deeper understanding and provides an incentive for students to learn. The article goes on to discuss state and national developments relative to school-to-work and highlights promising developments in Austin, Texas.

Grubb, W. N. (1994). True reform or tired retread? Seven questions to ask about school-to-work programs. *Education Week, 13*(40), 53-54.

Grubb examines the different foci of school-to-work initiatives and the connection between school-to-work and other school reform efforts. Grubb's main concern is that school-to-work will become yet another short-lived reform approach that will not lead to substantive change. He articulates seven questions for educators and policymakers to consider in designing thoughtful school-to-work initiatives that lead to positive changes in student learning and achievement. The seven questions explore issues of organizational change, work-based learning, linkages between school- and work-based experiences, access to school-to-work programs, assessment, and governance.

Kazis, R. (1993). *Improving the transition from school to work in the United States*. Cambridge, MA: Jobs for the Future, Inc.

Focusing on the theme of America competitiveness in the world economy, Kazis uses facts and statistics to detail deficiencies in our preparation of young people for the labor market. He notes that although educators, the business community, and the public agree that significant energies must be devoted to rectifying this situation, they have yet to agree on what exactly should be done. For Kazis, an effective program to prepare students for work must incorporate a system of rewards and motivations that apply both to the students and the employwers. The responsibility for these rewards is shared between the businesses, educators, and public policymakers.

Murname, R. J., & Levy F. (1992). Education and training. In H. J. Aaron & C. L. Schultze (Eds.), *Setting domestic priorities: What can government do?* (pp. 185-222). Washington, DC: Brookings Institute.

The authors describe the difficulties facing American youth who do not attend college, especially in reference to their employment and earning power. They also contrast the U.S.'s approach to preparing students for the job market with various German and Japanese models.

Paris, K. (1995). *Improving school-to-work transition for all students: A review of the literature*. In the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory's *Pathways to School Improvement* server [on-line]. Available: http://www.ncrel.org/ncrel/sdrs/pathways.htm.

This Critical Issue in NCREL's *Pathways to School Improvement* server features a synthesis of research and best practice on school-to-work transition. The author discusses the 1994 School-to-Work Opportunities Act and includes a link to the actual text of the Act. She also explores strategies for putting school-to-work initiatives into place, challenges to implementing such initiatives, and provides recommendations for overcoming those barriers.

Pauly, E., Kopp H., & Haimson, J. (1995). Home grown lessons: *Innovative programs linking school to work*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

This book provides detailed information about planning, developing, and implementing school-to-work initiatives. The authors offer suggestions about targeting, recruiting, and selecting students; getting local employers involved in initiatives; and overcoming the challenges of implementation. The book also includes policy and practice recommendations and profiles of programs.

Texas Association of School Boards. (1993). *Journal of Texas Public Education: Articles on School to Work Transition, 1*(4).

The articles in this edition of the *Journal of Texas Public Education* explore the topic of school-to-work transition. Articles discuss the need for school-to-work programs, strategies for implementing and evaluating school-to-work initiatives, skill standards and certification, the promise and possibilities of a Tech-Prep Associates Degree, transition programs in Japan and German, and school-to-work programs in Texas.

U. S. Department of Labor Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills (SCANS). (1991). *Skills and tasks for jobs: A SCANS report for America 2000*. Washington, DC: Author.

This report describes the essential knowledge and skills that high school graduates need in order to compete for the high skill jobs of the 21st century global economy. It describes two classes of needed workplace skills: "foundation or tool skills"—which are further defined as basic skills, thinking skills, and personal qualities—and "generic workplace competencies"—which involve resource allocation and interpersonal skills as well as understanding systems and technologies. Many believe specific occupational competencies also should be included.

U. S. Department of Labor, Employment, and Training. (1992). *School-to-work connections: Formulas for success*. Washington, DC: Author.

This publication reports on a study of successful school-to-work programs across the country that was conducted by the U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training. The document lists the keys to the success of these programs, with an emphasis on those targeted at developing partnerships between the public and private sectors. It also offers concrete recommendations for establishing and maintaining such partnerships.

Winters, K. (1994). Building bridges from school-to-work. *Northwest Policy*. October-November.

In this article, Winters examines the poor preparation of today's students for the work world. He presents four promising models for linking school-to-work:

- Youth apprenticeships: This approach places students in actual worksites, working side-by-side with professionals.
- Tech Prep: Often referred to as 82 + 2S programs, Tech Prep initiatives involves two years of high school and two years of postsecondary instruction. Coursework is designed to prepare students for a variety of occupations within a specific industry.
- Career Academies. Typically organized as a school-within-a-school, these career academies bring together a group of students and a team of teachers for several hours each day. Teachers and students usually remain together for three years. Lessons focus on the academic and vocational aspects of a particular industry.
- Cooperative Education: These programs usually last a year or less and involve an arrangement whereby students are in school part of the day and spend the remainder working for local businesses.

Finally, the article describes eight principles commonly found in successful school-to-work initiatives.

References: Collaborating For The Common Good

Ada, A. F. (1994). Foreword. In S. P. McCaleb, (Ed.), *Building communities of learners.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Annie E. Casey Foundation. (1995, August). *The path of most resistance: Reflections on lessons learned from New Futures.* Baltimore, MD: Author.

Bell, A., & Sigsworth, A. (1987). Education and community development: What can the school do. In A. Bell & A. Sigsworth, (Eds.), *The small rural primary school.* Bristol, PA: Falmer Press.

Benson, C. S. (1993). School to work transition: What is it? Do we need it? How do we obtain it? How will we know if it is effective? *Journal of Texas Public Education, 1*(4), 1-12.

Bissett, D. (1993). School-to-work transition: Implementing a critical work force preparation strategy. *Journal of Texas Public Instruction, 1*(4), 13-18.

Bricker, D. C. (1989). *Classroom life as civic education: Individual achievement and student cooperation in schools.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Charner, I., Fraser, B. S., Hubbard, S., Roger, A., & Horne, R. (1995). Reforms of the school-to-work transition: Findings, implications, and challenges. *Phi Delta Kappan,* 77(1), 40, 58-60.

Commission on Skills in the American Workforce. (1990). *America's choice: High skills or low wages.* Rochester, NY: National Center for Education and the Economy.

Dryfoos, J. (1994). *Full-service schools.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Glover, R. W. (1993). School-to-work transition: An essential component of effective school reform. *Journal of Texas Public Education, 1*(4), 29-40.

Grubb, W. N. (1994). True reform or tired retread? Seven questions to ask about school-to-work programs. *Education Week, 13*(40), 53-54.

Hull, J. L. (1994). *School-to-life planning: Broadening rural students' horizons.* Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Institute for Educational Leadership. (1994). *Preparing collaborative leaders: A facilitator's guide.* Washington, DC: Author.

Kirst, M. (1994, September). *School linked services: Appraisal, financing, and future directions.* Paper prepared for the AERA/OERI Conference on School Linked Services, Leesburg, VA.

Kirst, M., & Jehl, J. (1995). *Getting ready to provide school-linked, integrated services.* Oak Brook, IL: North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. (Originally published in Spring, 1992 in *The future of children: School linked services.* Los Altos, CA: Center for the Future of Children, David and Lucile Packard Foundation).

Kozol, J. (1967). *Death at an early age: The destruction of the hearts and minds of Negro children in the Boston public schools.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Kozol, J. (1989). *Rachel and her children: Homeless families in America.* New York: Fawcett Columbine.

Kozol, J. (1991). *Savage inequalities: Children in America's schools.* New York: Crown Publishers.

Kozol, J. (1995). *Amazing grace: The lives of children and the conscience of a nation.* New York: Crown Publishers.

Lasch, C. (1978). *The culture of narcissism: American life in an age of diminishing expectations.* New York: Norton.

Levy, J. E., with Copple, C. (1989). *Joining forces: A report from the first year.* Alexandria, VA: National Association of State Boards of Education.

Lockwood, A. T. (forthcoming). *Conversations with educational leaders: Contemporary viewpoints on education in America.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Mattessich, P. W., & Monsey, B. R. (1993). *Collaboration: What makes it work.* St. Paul, MN: Amherst H. Wilder Foundation.

MDC, Inc. (1991). *Let's do it our way: Working together for educational excellence.* Chapel Hill, NC: Author.

Miller, B. A. (1991). *Distress and survival: Rural schools, education, and the importance of community.* Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Nieto, S. (1992). *Affirming diversity: The socio-political context of multicultural education.* New York: Longman Publishing Group.

continued inside back flap

continued from page 31

Paris, K. (1994). *A leadership model for planning and implementing change for school-to-work transition.* Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Center on Education and Work.

Pauly, E., Kopp, H., & Haimson, J. (1995). *Home grown lessons: Innovative programs linking school to work.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Riesman, D., with Glazer, N., & Denney, R. (1950). *The lonely crowd.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

U. S. Department of Labor Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills (SCANS). (1991). *Skills and tasks for jobs: A SCANS report for America 2000.* Washington, DC: Author.

U. S. Department of Labor, Employment, and Training. (1992). *School-to-work connections: Formulas for success.* Washington, DC: Author.

Wehlage, G. G., & White, J. A. (1995). *Citizens, clients, and consumers: Building social capital.* Madison, WI: Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools.

Weiss, H. B, Woodrum, A., Lopez, M. E., & Kraemer, J. (1993). *Building villages to raise our children: From programs to service systems.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard Family Research Project.

Winters, K. (1994, October-November). Building bridges from school-to-work. *Northwest Policy.*

SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY COLLABORATION

Acknowledgements

Jeri Nowakowski, Executive Director
Dennis Gooler, Associate Director, Programs and Services
Lynn J. Stinnette, Director, Center for School and Community Development
Anne Turnbaugh Lockwood, Senior Writer and Policy Analyst
Robin Fleming, Program Assistant, Center for School and Community Development
Rhonda Dix, Graphic Designer
David M. Grossmann, Photographer
Stephanie Blaser, Copy Editor

One of ten federally funded regional educational laboratories, NCREL provides resources to educators, policymakers, and communities in a seven-state region. Our goal is to support school restructuring to promote learning for all students, especially those most at risk of academic failure.

NCREL's Center for School and Community Development supports schools and communities as they undertake continuous, sustainable school development to improve learning. The Center identifies and organizes research information and best-practice models to help schools and communities improve their planning, decisionmaking, and action so that students achieve at high levels. The Center also provides technical assistance, training, and consultation to help schools and communities invest in continuous growth while meeting today's needs.

NEW LEADERS FOR TOMORROW'S SCHOOLS

LOOK FOR future issues on privatization (Spring 1996) and "productive schools" (Fall 1996). Also, we'd like to hear your comments... drop us a line!

NCREL
North Central Regional Educational Laboratory
1900 Spring Road, Suite 300
Oak Brook, Illinois 60521-1480

Non-Profit Org.
U.S.Postage
PAID
Permit No. 6784
Chicago, IL